

apply this law without using racial profiling, without assuming that someone named Gutierrez isn't less likely to be in this country legally than someone named Smith.

That's an amazing skill. Maybe with practice, we can all become like Arizona politicians and police officers who are able to telepathically determine who to accuse of not belonging in America.

But let's take a quiz together this morning and learn how to pick out the suspect. Here are two journalists, Geraldo Rivera and Ted Koppel.

At a traffic stop, to the untrained eye, we might guess that Geraldo Rivera, for some reason that clearly has nothing to do with the way he looks, might not be from America. Geraldo Rivera's mustache wouldn't confuse an Arizona law enforcement professional. They would know that Geraldo Rivera was born in Brooklyn, New York, and that Ted Koppel was born in Europe, in England, where his parents moved to flee from Hitler and Nazi Germany.

Round two, this for our young fans of C-SPAN. This is Justin Bieber and Selena Gomez. These young people have overcome their very different national origins and become apparently a happy couple. I'm sure Justin helped Gomez learn all about American customs and feel more at home in her adopted country. Oh, wait a minute. I'm sorry, because I'm not a trained Arizona official, I somehow got that backwards. Actually, Ms. Gomez, of Texas, has helped Mr. Bieber, of Canada, learn about his adopted country.

Justin, when you perform in Phoenix, remember to bring your papers.

The next round shows how tricky Arizona's game of pick out the immigrant is to play. Here are two basketball superstars. Neither one is Latino. That's confusing already. You have to dig deeper to figure out who isn't the real American. So let's consider their names—Jeremy Lin and Tony Parker. Clearly, "Lin" sounds kind of foreign while "Tony Parker" sounds American to me. But I'm not an Arizona police officer who would know that Jeremy Lin was born in Los Angeles, and Tony Parker—oops—Europe, Belgium. Wrong once again.

Finally, here's just one more.

In case the Supreme Court ever wants to meet in Phoenix to consider its ruling about Arizona's "show me your papers" law, if these two Justices step out to Starbucks, which one do you think is likeliest to be a suspect, the Anglo male or the Latina? Neither is an immigrant, but Antonin Scalia's father came through Ellis Island from Italy, and Sonia Sotomayor is a proud Puerto Rican with generations of U.S. citizen ancestors.

We could play this game all day, but the point is simple. The idea that any government official can determine who belongs in America and who doesn't simply by looking at them is completely ridiculous, unfair, and un-American, and yet this absurdity is the law of Arizona.

The Court signaled that it will be watching this law closely, and it should, because we count on the Court to protect our liberties, not restrict them.

□ 1020

Because, in America, people should always be judged by their actions. No person, not one, should be judged by the way they look, the sound of their voice, or the pronunciation of their last name—not in Arizona, not anywhere, not ever.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

AMERICAN CENTER FOR THE CURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, as the Supreme Court is about to rule on the health care law, Americans all across the country are focusing again on health care.

Health care makes up about one-fifth of the United States' economy, and it is increasingly taking up a larger share of our Federal budget, so it's important that we look to implement strategies that bend the cost curve down.

Scientific research over the years has enhanced our understanding of disease and has continuously led to many breakthrough treatments. However, it is critical that we emphasize not just treatment, but specifically cures for diseases as well.

Last year, the United States Government spent just under \$32 billion to help the National Institutes of Health carry out its critical mission: seeking fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems, applying that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce the burdens of illness and disability.

The NIH, Mr. Speaker, has earned a proud reputation for its research and has made a positive impact in the health care world. I'm a firm supporter of the NIH, and I spoke this past March to the House Budget Committee about the importance of funding NIH's mission. However, I also believe that we can always do more with the resources that we have and believe that we should refocus a portion of our health care resources toward a new mission. One idea that has been brought to me is a center that concentrates exclusively on eliminating diseases rather than continuing the practice of just treating diseases.

This center, known as the American Center for Cures, would be a public-private partnership that utilizes the resources of the government with the creativity and accountability of the private sector to find cures for the diseases that in some way affect almost everyone on the planet—diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, just to name a new.

By bringing our Nation's best and brightest minds together, from business boardrooms to scientists from around the world, the center would singularly devote its efforts to curing diseases by establishing renewed lines of communication amongst the world's most reputable scientists, funding collaborative research, unblocking bottlenecks in clinical research, facilitating speedy clinical trials, and ensuring that the research performed remains focuses on outcomes and results.

In addition to promoting the United States as the leading place for innovations and pioneering medical research, finding cures to some of mankind's deadliest diseases would also have global implications. The money saved by not having to dedicate it to treating or managing a disease could be freed up and invested in education, infrastructure, and deficit reduction, and we would be able to further help raise the standards of living for everyone in developing nations and around the globe.

During these difficult fiscal times, Mr. Speaker, here in our own country we have to start thinking differently. Today, we spend approximately \$235 billion annually on treating diabetes alone. Think about the cost if we add Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. If the American Center for Cures could find a cure, think about the possibilities. Think about the good we could do, for instance, with 235 billion extra dollars right here. That's what we spend in our country. Think about what gets spent all around the globe.

We need to start thinking differently, Mr. Speaker. Change is hard, and change in Washington is even harder, but I believe that we have an obligation, as stewards of our taxpayers' hard-earned money, not only to effectively allocate their tax dollars in a manner that produces results, but change the way that we look at all the possibilities for our future. This mission could impact not just every American life, but every human on the planet.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER CONTEMPT VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific American Caucuses for coming to the floor to denounce the deeply partisan and divisive effort by congressional Republicans to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt. We need to be doing what the American people elected us to do, and that is to create jobs and to get our economy back on its feet.

This contempt vote stands in stark contrast to our duties in Congress. We should be devoting our time to creating jobs, addressing our Nation's neglected infrastructure, and ensuring that student loan rates don't balloon starting next week.

Too many hardworking American families are looking for their next paycheck, and yet this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is wasting precious legislative time and energy on a purely partisan effort to generate conflict where none exists.

The Republicans' claims against Attorney General Holder defy belief. The simple fact is the Bush administration developed the inappropriate tactics, and once this Justice Department, under President Obama, learned about it, Attorney General Holder stopped the program—stopped it.

So instead of handling our Nation's priorities, this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is choosing to stick its head in the sand, ignoring the wide range of documents and open cooperation provided by the Justice Department but now engage in a game of political theater with no regard for struggling families across America.

The true motivation behind this contempt resolution is simple: As Leader PELOSI remarked last week, this is really about suppressing voter turnout. The National Rifle Association, unfortunately, has insisted that their supported Members of Congress vote for it or face political peril.

Let me tell you, these Tea Party Republicans don't like it when their ideological efforts to prevent people from voting get blocked by the Justice Department doing its job—and that's defending the Constitution of the United States. They know they can't win in judicial courts and they cannot win in the court of public opinion, so instead they're doing all they can to undermine the Justice Department by dragging Attorney General Holder through the mud, making endless demands, changing the goal posts, and monopolizing his time so that they can continue their efforts to undermine the democratic process. And they're asking for information that would violate the law. Furthermore, this is unprecedented. The House has never voted to hold an Attorney General in contempt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of seeing these Tea Party Republicans pursue a senseless and destructive agenda. There's a reason that Congress has the lowest approval rating in history, and it has everything to do with efforts like this—a contempt vote that does nothing to improve the economy, does nothing to create jobs, and does nothing to strengthen our middle class or to help those trying to raise themselves out of poverty.

We need to invest in transportation, in education, and in ensuring above all that jobs and jobs and more jobs are added to our economic recovery. We only have a matter of weeks before Congress effectively shuts down for the August recess, and we cannot waste any more time doing anything other than putting Americans back to work. Jobs should be our number one priority, our number two priority, and our number three priority.

So I join my colleagues in the tri-caucuses calling for an end to this useless path of petty politics. Let us work during the remainder of time we have this congressional session to do the work that we were sent here to do. No more political witch hunts, no more political fishing expeditions, no more excuses. It's time to get back to work.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, two new words were added to the American immigration policy: "Prosecutorial discretion."

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano recently ordered Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials to not deport certain classes of aliens who are in the country illegally. Instead, these illegal aliens will be given 2-year work permits that can be renewed indefinitely. The reason Secretary Napolitano and President Obama have given the American people for this de facto amnesty program is prosecutorial discretion.

The Secretary and the President claim that the Department of Homeland Security personnel can use their discretion to decide what individuals they can and cannot deport. But in Federal immigration law, this discretion does not exist. Congress took it away from the executive branch in 1996 when it passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

□ 1030

The law requires, and I will repeat that, this law requires immigration officials to address illegal aliens when they become aware that they are in the country illegally. It clearly spells out the actions that must be taken by Federal officials.

In fact, according to one of the Nation's leading experts on immigration, Congress, frustrated at the time because the Clinton administration was using it to let thousands of illegal aliens remain in the United States, wrote the law to remove that discretion. In other words, the discretion that President Obama and Secretary Napolitano claim they use no longer exists because Congress deliberately eliminated it in 1996. By stating they still have it, President Obama and Secretary Napolitano are actually ordering Federal immigration officials to break the law.

Since the executive branch is citing a privilege that no longer exists in ordering Federal immigration officials to break the 1996 immigration act which was passed by Congress and signed into law, today, I'm calling on the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees to hold hearings to investigate the legality of this decision to use so-called "prosecutorial discretion."

Just this week we heard from the United States Supreme Court that because the Federal Government writes immigration laws, State laws must work in harmony with the Federal Government. In striking down part of Arizona's S.B. 1070, the High Court's majority said that Federal law shall be the supreme law of the land when laws do not work in harmony with the Federal scheme or when Federal law is explicit. Well, in this case, the law is very clear: there is no prosecutorial discretion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my district in Pennsylvania has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State, and our country is still reeling from one of the worst recessions we have ever faced. The Department of Homeland Security's unlawful action could have grave consequences on our labor force and on our economy, both at the local and national levels.

Additionally, allowing individuals with forged documents to remain in this country could pose a serious threat to our homeland security.

Let me also state that I am troubled by the expansion of the authority of the President that he believes he has. In the past, President Obama clearly stated he had to follow existing immigration laws. During a town hall meeting with Univision in March 2011, he said:

America is a Nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that.

During that same town hall meeting, President Obama also said:

There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system, that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

So what changed? In the last 15 months, did Congress grant the President new powers? I don't remember doing that. Fifteen months ago, President Obama said he can't ignore congressional mandates. But suddenly, 2 weeks ago, he can? Again, I ask, what changed?

I'm concerned President Obama overstepped his constitutional authority in this case, just as he did in claiming executive privilege in Operation Fast and Furious. That's why these two committees must hold formal hearings and investigate this claim of discretion and the unilateral rewriting of Federal immigration policy.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the centerpiece of President Obama's 2008 Presidential campaign was the promise of health care reform. He told us, time and time again, that every President has seen the urgency of reform, that all of them had attempted reform, and none succeeded.